

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 1919

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Office: 125 Nassau Street, New York. Editor: J. A. Suter, President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, 125 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone: Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, including Postage in the United States and Canada:

| | One Year | Six Months | Three Months |
|---------------------|----------|------------|--------------|
| Daily and Sunday | \$10.00 | \$5.00 | \$3.00 |
| Daily only | 8.00 | 4.00 | 2.50 |
| Sunday only | 3.00 | 1.50 | .75 |
| Sunday only, Canada | 6.00 | 3.25 | 1.75 |

| | One Year | Six Months | Three Months |
|---------------------|----------|------------|--------------|
| Daily and Sunday | \$10.00 | \$5.00 | \$3.00 |
| Daily only | 8.00 | 4.00 | 2.50 |
| Sunday only | 3.00 | 1.50 | .75 |
| Sunday only, Canada | 6.00 | 3.25 | 1.75 |

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches received by it, and also the local news of agencies owned and published herein.
All rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

China's Lesson

During the last fifty years China, it is said, has been a subject of international deliberation no less than twenty-nine times. No other country has been as much becalmed—no one so often confuted.

So much so that the Chinese diplomat, one who understands the infinite complications and has some knowledge of the voluminous record, has become a distinct variety of the species. China's involved business is rated beyond the comprehension of those lacking special training.

Yet China's affairs, though often settled, never remain settled. There is a beautiful agreement with respect to the principles that China's integrity and independence must be respected and that all are to participate equally in her trade. Yet, in the guise of considering details, rolling along the alley of events comes a bowling ball to knock down the carefully set up pins.

Why does the settled never settle? Why is China the sick man of the Far East? It is worth while for Henry Ford, whose prejudice against the instruction of history perhaps does not run against facts spread before him by the newspapers of his generation, to ponder the matter. It is also worth while for other eulogists of internationalism and critics of nationalism to ponder it.

China is a source of continuing anxiety, it would seem, because she is pacifist and because, as an incident of her pacifism, she lacks ability or desire to fight. She has disarmed without waiting for others to disarm, and in consequence has been prey of Manchian and Mongol, of Russian and German and, in prior days, of British, French and Portuguese, and promises to be the favored exploiting ground of the enterprising Jap. And when not futtily wrangling with the alien who would profane her ancestors, she has been torn by civil war.

Pacifism may work some time, but not now. Instead of being an example China is a warning. In theory she should exert a healing influence for peace, but in fact her condition makes for war between her neighbors, between her and them, and within herself. Colonel Roosevelt was anathema during his lifetime to professional pacifists, not because he loved or wanted war, but because he was enough of a true political philosopher to look on the world as it is and did not see the advantage of fooling ourselves, if no one else, by hypocritical pretences.

The world would be more blessed than it is if China both could and would defend herself against unjust aggression. Her population is 400,000,000—physically and mentally as strong, perhaps, as the average of mankind. She can guard her own frontiers. The mere knowledge that she proposed to use her power in a just cause would settle the Chinese problem. Probably nothing else will.

There is better prospect of peace through a general recognition of the duty of protecting oneself than in quoting the saying of Franklin, that the worst peace is better than the best war—a maxim in which Franklin did not himself believe, for he was a zealous leader in supporting two wars.

Confucius was a great man, but he did not advantage peace much by inducing his people to accept doctrines of non-resistance; and neither do our long hairs and short hairs help peace when they lift their thin voices in complaints of nationalism and of patriotism, the spirit which gives nationalism its energy.

"Acceleration"

Senator Kenyon complains of the flood of stock letters and telegrams with which he and other Senators are deluged. These stereotyped communications are signed by people willing to oblige some propagandist or publicity manager. The cost of sending the telegram is paid not by the sender but by the interest which solicits his signature.

Thus a factitious public sentiment is created. It is the time-honored process of "acceleration." But it has been overplayed so much that its effectiveness has vanished. There has been a shrinkage of returns on the telegraph tolls.

The best defense of public men against this annoyance is an exposure of its futility. The next best is to ignore such manufactured sentiment. Senator Williams told a good deal of truth when he said that the "accelerators" thrive on

the general conviction that Senators and Representatives can be stampeded by what looks even remotely like a concerted expression of outside opinion. If Senators trusted more in their own capacity to interpret public opinion, he said, the business of artificial publicity would languish. The "accelerator" is a nuisance. He would cease to be one if Congressmen didn't too often help him to play his game.

Jerusalem's First Mayor

If Nathan Straus, New York's distinguished merchant and philanthropist, wishes to be the first Mayor of Jerusalem, let us hope it will not be deemed an unwarranted intrusion in the politics of another community to express a wish for the gratification of his ambition.

Mr. Straus, by a long life of service to this community, has earned a right to take a series of sabbatical years to devote himself to new usefulness, while being carried on our rolls as a citizen emeritus. In Jerusalem, which his benefactions long ago reached and where his name is deemed blessed by those who have suffered during the long night, he will surely be welcomed. It would be of good omen to have as the first magistrate of the new Zion one whose thought was not to get something for himself or for hangers-on.

It has been the habit, and is still the habit, of some to smile incredulously at the Zionist ideal. But its adherents were never as many as now. It is a fact of history that one group of the dispersed of Judea, even though living in plenty and honor in Babylon, were moved to go to the ancient site, then as much a mess of prostrate brick as Verdun, and did recreate the city and rebuild the Temple. Thus was rebuked the polite derision of the best circles of Babylon.

Even though Jerusalem becomes no great capital in commerce and population, it will have power as a spiritual capital of a sort much needed by an unquiet world.

The British Ratification

In closing his address urging the ratification of the Versailles treaty Lloyd George brought back a wandering debate to a main point by saying that the treaty would stand as "a lighthouse in the deep and a warning to nations and rulers of nations against the peril which the German Empire shattered itself against."

Peace and hopes of peace! There is more assurance of world safety in the record of what happened to Germany than in all the paper agreements. To the degree that there is demonstration that aggressive war does not pay the world has gained, but lacking this vital and energizing factor comments are of slight value.

Punishment, not to punish, but to deter—here is a principle the British Premier never allowed to become confused in his mind. He secured that which he sought, and at the same time was a party to the closing of no door to peace based on good will rather than on the fears of the wicked. In details Lloyd George has been inconsistent, but for five years he has little wavered as to fundamental matters. Many regretted the departure of Asquith, but despite his great gifts and sound purpose would he have displayed the grit and see-it-through-right spirit of his successor?

Not wearying in well doing, the House of Commons by unanimous vote approved of the insurance treaty for the defense of France, Great Britain thus showing as much alertness concerning the future as she has shown determination in the past.

Venezelos's Protest

Premier Venezelos wants to know why the United States is participating in the negotiation of a treaty of peace between the Allied powers and Bulgaria. The same question has puzzled many Americans.

The United States has never been at war with Bulgaria. Diplomatic relations were not interrupted during the period in which we were at war with Germany and Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria's allies. The Bulgarian Minister remained at his post in Washington. We had a diplomatic representative in Sofia. He went to Salonica with the Bulgarian plenipotentiaries who asked General Franchet d'Esperey for an armistice.

How can the United States, never having engaged in hostilities with Bulgaria, take a hand as a belligerent in framing a treaty of peace with her? We already have treaties of amity with her which have never been broken. And if not as a belligerent, in what other rôle can the United States enter a peace parley with the Bulgarians?

The contention has been set up that we may become a party to the Bulgarian treaty because it contains the covenant of the league of nations. The representatives of the United States at Paris have already signed a treaty with Germany which embraces the covenant. They will probably soon sign a treaty with Austria, also including it. The ratification of either of these conventions would bring us into the league. The argument that we must sign a peace treaty with a power with which we are already at peace merely in order to assure our admission into the society of nations is too sophisticated to take seriously.

Venezelos, moreover, questions the propriety of American participation in the framing of a treaty with Bulgaria, not because our delegates merely want to subscribe to the covenant for a third time but because they are discussing and passing upon territorial settlements. The United States has no right to sit at a council board at which Bulgarian territory is being disposed of. This country is an outsider in all such mat-

ters. Its opinion of them can properly be expressed only in its capacity as a benevolent neutral.

Paris dispatches say that the American delegates left in Paris have asked President Wilson whether or not they shall sign the Bulgarian treaty. Venezelos's objection gives them an opportunity to retire gracefully from a false position. They have participated in the Bulgarian conferences on sufferance. Now that their right to participate has been challenged, the only dignified and tactful course open to them is to withdraw.

The Washington Riots

The disgraceful race conflict that has sullied Washington and which makes our pretensions of sympathy for justice seem grossly hypocritical presents phenomena usual in such disturbances—that is to say, the chasers are mainly white men and the chased are mainly black men.

Driven into corners, the primary instinct of self-defense has asserted itself, and the assailed have armed themselves and when opportunity offered have attempted retaliation.

The usual excuse is given that black men are attacking white women, but so far few particulars of this are given, and the reports are to be accepted with reserve as at least exaggerated. But even though there are negro criminals, as there are, there is no reason for a general attack on the innocent. The outbreak is to be attributed to blind race prejudice—to the feeling entertained by many temporarily in Washington that negroes need to be taught their places; that in Washington they are not sufficiently abject in their manners.

Licensing Dye Imports

No reason can be advanced for the injection of partisanship into the bill for licensing the import of dyestuffs which Representative Longworth announces will soon be favorably reported by the House Ways and Means Committee. Here is an aftermath of the war which should be considered wholly from the standpoint of patriotism and legitimate national defense.

The facts in the main are clear to the public. In the pre-war period the German chemical companies, under the patronage of the German government, attained a practical monopoly of the making of dyestuffs. When hostilities closed German ports manufacturers everywhere, particularly in this country, found themselves cut off from an essential raw material. But chemists went to work, capital was enlisted, and by a rare exercise of energy the void was partially filled.

But the work was only half done when our ports were reopened by the President to German trade. We were turning out many dyes, and prices of some had been lowered by domestic competition below the former level, but we did not make a full line. It was necessary to get a market for by-products and to perfect processes. We do not produce all colors, and as to those which we do not produce Germany is now in a position to control our market and at the same time to dictate prices.

The mere imposition of a protective tariff is not enough to meet the problem, for our manufacturers for an indefinite period must get some German dyes or be at a disadvantage in international competition. At the same time our chemists must be encouraged to continue their work. So a license system is necessary to secure dyes that are needed and to avoid injury to our developing dye industry. A license system under which control will be with a commission of manufacturers, consumers and the government seems essential, even though theoretically objectionable.

The abnormality of the dye-making industry was recognized by President Wilson when he said in his message that it must be safeguarded for political as well as economic reasons. A dye plant is also a maker of the raw materials of munitions of war. The treaty dismantles Germany's cannon works and her aircraft factories, but her chemical plants are to remain intact. It will scarcely do to allow to her again the advantage she possessed in 1914. Legitimate defense requires we have complete chemical works if we would not be helpless before gas makers.

In the opinion of practically all who have studied the complicated and ramified dyestuff problem the license method gives the only promise of solution. The duration of the system is to be limited to five years. By that time we may expect to have the means to protect ourselves, but new the development could be throttled and the country thus denied the basis of munition making.

The Congressmen who vote against this preparedness bill will have a difficult time explaining to both his conscience and to his constituents.

The Bite That Failed

As a rule, the relations between Russians and Japanese soldiers in Siberia have been friendly enough. But as a town on the Transiberian Railway, which had just been freed from the foot tyranny of Bolshevik rule, a Japanese soldier haled a big, staring moujik into the presence of his commanding officer. "What has he been doing?" asked the colonel. "I gave him a cigarette," said the soldier, "and then he tried to bite me!" Kissing, even between members of the opposite sexes, is not a Japanese custom.

"L" in Boston

Affairs on the elevated railway are up in the air all right. The receipts are not enough to pay the running expenses of the road, a third of the patrons prefer to walk to paying the ten cent fares and now the employees are demanding a wage scale of something like \$6.00 a day.

Why the Early Morning Worker Objects?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: If you, by investigation or personal inquiry, should get in touch with the advocates of daylight saving I am positive that you will find that their hour of starting their day's work is 8, 9 or 10 a. m. and that they are through at 4, 4:30 or 5 p. m.

These are nice, agreeable hours, but what about the thousands right in the city of New York who begin their day at from 5:30 to 6 a. m., which means arising at 4:15 or 4:30? We workers do not base our objections on the fact that we are compelled to arise in darkness during the summer as well as the winter months wholly, but to the added fact that we are deprived of an hour or more sleep every night. As it is daylight till 9 or after we consider ourselves very lucky if we can get to sleep at 10. This is only six to six and one-half hours' sleep, depending on whether our clock rings at 4:15 or 4:30.

As we work seven days a week (in my case it is seventy-three hours), we find this loss of sleep a very serious affair, and it is no self-deception either. If any of the members of the Daylight Saving Association think it is let them try these hours for a week and I'll wager they will agree with us.

And we are not farmers nor milkmen either; just motormen and conductors on the early runs in every community where street cars are in operation. The writer is a conductor in New York City now recovering from an illness in the country, brought on as a direct result of loss of sleep.

E. T. BURNS.

Kingston, N. Y., July 19, 1919.

"A Disgusting Farce"

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Having had my second gold stripe for some time, and with chances of getting a third one, I would like to ask a few questions which up to the present time have not been answered by any one over here.

I should like to know why our eminent Secretary Baker published the statement that all National Army men would be out of France by July 1, 1919? In the organization that I am part of (a very humble part at that) there are at least 5,000 N. A. men, and a good share are wearing wound stripes at that. We are prisoner of war escort men and have no chance of being relieved until our Allies, France it seems in particular, get over the Hun scare. Why should we men, who were drafted (many volunteered), be made to remain here while thousands of French soldiers are going around free; while there are regular army men who never saw service in the A. E. F. still in the states; while there are volunteers for service over there? Why not let those men come over and relieve us? We did our bit before the 11th of November, 1918, and, believe me, since that day we have done it doubly so.

One more thing. There are men in these companies who are married and can't get out because of "no replacements available." Where are those 50,000 volunteers? To say that the men are discouraged is putting it mildly. The P. W.'s do nothing while on the job, as they know peace is signed, and the whole affair is a "disgusting farce." We men want to get back to our jobs before the people forget that we are still alive. We are not soldiers by profession. Let those who are come over. We should be glad to see them.

We are not veterans, nor are we A. W. O. L. men! No, we are simply S. O. L. until the French government wants to have the P. W.'s relieved.

SERGEANT.

P. W. E. Company 223.

Bourg, France, July 9, 1919.

The Freedom of the City

(From The London Morning Post)

The freedom of the City of London, with which the Prince of Wales is to be presented to-morrow, is one of the most cherished and ancient of civic privileges. The actual document given to his royal highness is a piece of parchment inscribed with his names and titles and guaranteeing to him and his descendants many privileges to which he would not otherwise be entitled. Thus he will not have to pay a tax on any goods brought within the city gates, nor will he have to render naval or military service. Should he fall on evil times the Prince of Wales would be entitled to pecuniary aid. Should he in the course of years pass away, leaving children behind, the City Chamberlain would educate them and administer their property until they arrive at years of maturity. It is usual to enclose the "freedom" in a gold casket, which costs the city £100, but the certificate, in the case of the Prince of Wales, will be in a frame and the casket will be represented by silver plate. In the case of General Booth the casket was of simple, sturdy oak.

Deplorable but True

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to compliment you most heartily upon the spirit and timeliness of your editorial in yesterday's Tribune relative to Field Marshal Haig's eulogy of his armies.

It is deplorable, but none the less true, that there are among us those who must be taught a proper appreciation of British achievement under such men as Sir Douglas Haig.

A. S. STEWART.

New York, July 19, 1919.

Well, Is There?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Is there a river in the United States famous for being as broad as it is long?

G. L. MUCKENPUSS.

New York, July 20, 1919.

Ample Warning

(From The Cleveland Plain Dealer)

Germany will import footwear freely, says Berlin. Better buy your winter shoes before the rush starts.

Why, Indeed?

(From The Tacoma Ledger)

Congress will have to decide what percentage of alcohol makes a drink intoxicating. Why ask Congressmen?

The Chinese Puzzle

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: There are certain features in the Japan Shantung situation which are easily described but so far as I know have not yet been put forward. They seem to me to go to the very roots of the matter.

For example, shortly after Germany took what she wanted in Shantung, England took the harbor and fortifications of Wei-hai-wei and hinterland (about 200 miles north of Tientsin), altogether 288,000 square miles. This is nearly 100,000 square miles more than is included in the Kiaochow treaty between China and Japan. Then France took another slice in Tonkin, so that Germany, England and France all grabbed at the same time—only Germany began it, landed troops and killed Chinese, who naturally defended themselves against an attack on the Tientsin forts.

When, therefore, China brought up the Shantung question at Paris what were the positions of the four great nations involved? England and France were both guilty of grabbing when Germany did. So they couldn't vote to restore Shantung to China without giving up their own spoils. Besides, England and France had agreed with Japan before she entered the war to back up her treaty with China, involving the transfer of certain of the German concessions in Shantung. Then, again, the alliance between England and Japan stipulated that in case of war in which both were involved they would "make peace together." Could England desert her ally? So we see that neither England nor France could possibly vote against Japan.

Let us see if Chinese hands "are clean" in this court. Why did China join in the war? Because Japan wanted her? Not at all. Japan did not want her loans to China spent on war. She was lending money to China to keep her alive when no other power could do so. China was all but penniless. She owed Boxer indemnities to Germany which called for \$20,000,000 a year interest! Her debts to France, England, Italy and Russia, on the same account, were up in the hundreds of millions, and she was unable to manage her own household. No one knows just what happened just before China took sides with the Allies, but we do know that in September, 1917, the representatives of the Entente Powers told the Chinese government that payments on indemnities would be postponed for five years, which relieved China from paying the two or more hundred millions due in that period.

What was Japan's position in Paris? It would take long chapters to give it in full, for the record upon which her representatives stood was a remarkable one. Her representatives could say, if they chose, that their alliance with England bound them to make peace together on all questions, and so they could withdraw if they wished; that England and France had agreed that Japan should have a foothold in Shantung—perhaps because there are 300,000 Japanese in China and perhaps to prevent China from giving the concession back to Germany at a price equal to the Boxer indemnity! (Who can tell what the present inefficient Chinese government would do?)

Moreover, the Japanese representatives could point out that they had disposed of Germany in the Orient; had paid all their own war expenses; had kept a large army ready to take part in India or Siberia or wherever wanted; had sent destroyers into the Mediterranean Sea and the Baltic; cruisers into the North Sea and lent submarines to Italy. She had in fact, made the Pacific safe.

The list by no means ends here, as any one may find out by research, but it may well end with a view of Japan's financial position at the Paris conferences. Not only had she paid all her war expenses from her own purse (the only big power who had not borrowed of us) but she had lent England 371,000,000 yen; Russia, 127,000,000, and France, 75,000,000.

She had done all that had been asked of her, and her representatives, who were in all respects the peers of any others, went to Paris expecting to be treated like equals. Were they? Is Japan now being treated in this country as a friendly ally should be?

Might she not say to our Congress, "Clean your hands by settling with Colombia before you tell us that we are going to dishonor ourselves in our future dealings with China. Our record is clean. Make yours like it."

J. B. MILLET.

New York, July 20, 1919.

Peru's Overturn

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have been instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Peru to place before the public of the United States the following facts in relation to the recent change in government which has taken place in Peru:

Augusto B. Leguia received an overwhelming majority of the electoral vote in Peru in the election which took place in May of this year. Notwithstanding this, it became known that it was the intention of the government of Dr. Pardo to avoid complying with the popular will. Congress, controlled by the friends of the government, was to nullify the elections, and a third person or compromise candidate was to have been elected, who consequently would not have had a popular majority. In carrying out this plan the former government began to close printing offices where publications supporting Leguia were published, placing therein military guards, which were withdrawn by the present government, notwithstanding that judges, the Superior Court and later the Supreme Court ordered the Minister of Justice and other authorities to return these properties to their owners.

At the same time persons in public life and those identified with politics, as well as workmen, all supporters of Leguia, were imprisoned. These acts of force were clearly dictatorial and were carried out in spite of public protest. In view of this, and as these repressive measures increased day by day, the supporters of Leguia, backed by public opinion, decided as a last measure to act in order that the popular vote be not made sport of. On the morning of July 4 President Pardo was taken from the palace and placed in a separate department in the penitentiary, where he was treated with every consideration. The public forces respected the popular will and joined the movement, which took place

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: In your yesterday's paper there was published a statement made by "The Herald of Asia," in which it says that "if China wants to test Japan's sincerity let her refuse all further concessions to Occidental nations and secure for all the time the inalienation of her territory, and Japan's task in regard to China will be finished." China has, since the establishment of a republic, made no concession and alienated no territory to any Occidental nation. She was only coerced by her self-recommended "protector" to yield some very important concessions and to grant to her Oriental neighbor the extension of leases of Dairen and Port Arthur in 1915 by the notorious twenty-one demands. Japan's task of aggression was still going on, while China had proved herself to be firm in protecting her own territorial integrity and political independence.

It continues: "It is a question, however, whether China is yet able to do without the assistance of Japan in keeping foreign nations at bay; and this help, strange to say, is just what China does not want." There has been no single instance in the modern history of foreign relations of China that when China was invaded by Occidental nations Japan came to her help. On the contrary, the Occidental nations did come to China's help when Japan demanded Kwangtung Peninsula at the end of the Sino-Japanese War in 1895. What assistance did Japan give to China when Hong Kong, Wei-hai-wei, Port Arthur, Dairen, Kwang-chau Wan and Kiaochow were demanded of China by Occidental nations? If her ability was not enough to assist China, what is the use of boasting now? If she has such ability now, why does not she prove it to the world instead of merely saying it?

China can answer Japan that she is able to keep foreign nations at bay if Japan stops her aggression in China. China does not want such assistance from Japan as to keep Kiaochow and to hold economic and police rights in Shantung for her. She is competent enough to do that.

In your editorial of the same date you said: "Isn't it ridiculous for a world quiescent when many nations encroached on China to become excited when Japan contracts the grabbing disease? If there is a Kiaochow, there also is a Tonquin, a Hong Kong, a Shanghai, a Macao, and there were a Port Arthur and a Dairen and a German Kiaochow." May I say that China insists on the return of Kiaochow because it is legitimate, as China has declared war on Germany? All the rights in Shantung formerly held by Germany should be returned to China, for all the treaties and agreements were abrogated when war was declared. China wants to settle legitimately all the questions with Germany at the end of war in order that no difficulty can be raised in the future. Her request to the peace conference to review the Sino-Japanese treaty of 1915 is also a result of the war, as conditions have changed since China entered into the war. It is absurd to infer that China makes discrimination against Japan. She does not ask Japan to return Port Arthur and Dairen.

You said that "if Japan makes herself understood, she now is willing to do as others do; her policy is derived, not original; a reflex, exotic rather than indigenous." Do you know that she pretends all the time to help China, not to grab China? If she admits her guilt we can do nothing with her, because we are not yet prepared to fight a robber. While she talks as a friend and acts as an aggressor, we can at least help her words.

You further said: "We assert a right to set up a Monroe Doctrine for America, but question Japan's right to have a Monroe Doctrine for the Far East." Do you believe that Japan desires a real Monroe Doctrine in the Far East? She has ever acted in Asia as the United States does in America? No, she acts just contrary to this country. Then her right to have such a thing should not be questioned? Japan has grabbed lands from countries that she pretends to protect, secured all special rights in Asiatic nations which she looks upon as vassals. Is it the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe for America? Really, Japan is attempting to use this good term to realize her ambition. America should resent her using this term, as it is apparently an act to insult this country and President Monroe.

J. S. TOW.

New York, July 21, 1919.

without bloodshed. There was no interruption in the social and business life of the city. The holiday proclaimed in honor of the United States was held as planned. Enthusiastic meetings took place in the provinces in favor of the new government as soon as the news reached them, and the authorities and soldiers everywhere joined the movement without hesitation. The Supreme Court and other institutions have already recognized the new government.

President Leguia has received, from all parts, thousands of letters, cablegrams and telegrams of congratulation. There has been no change whatsoever in the normal life of the country.

EDUARDO HIGGINSON,
Consul General in the United States,
Consulate General of Peru,
New York, July 18, 1919.

The Great Olympic

(From The Halifax Morning Chronicle)

The Olympic will sever her connection with Halifax, let us hope, only temporarily, when she sails on her homeward voyage to-day. The famous White Star liner has played a great part during the war, and her services in transporting our soldiers to and fro without the loss of a man—will always associate her name with Canada's war effort. So regularly has the Olympic made her trips to Halifax during the past three years that we had begun to regard the ship as one of the permanent possessions of our port. The Olympic was popular, not only because she had carried tens of thousands of Canadian boys; her gallant captain, officers and men won a warm place in the hearts of the people, and when they sail away to-day they will carry with them the good wishes of troops of friends. This is said to be the last voyage of the Olympic from Halifax, but let us hope that it will be a "farewell performance" after the fashion of the stars of the theatrical world, which will recur many times. Meanwhile, we wish the Olympic and all her complement both voyage and good luck.

Books